Agenda
Planning Commission
Regular Meeting
CITY AND BOROUGH OF JUNEAU
Ben Haight, Chairman
February 28, 2017

I. ROLL CALL

Paul Voelckers, Vice Chairman, called the Regular Meeting of the City and Borough of Juneau (CBJ) Planning Commission (PC), held in the Assembly Chambers of the Municipal Building, to order at 7:01 p.m.

Commissioners present: Paul Voelckers, Vice Chairman; Michael LeVine, Nathaniel Dye, Dan Miller, Percy Frisby, Dan Hickok, Kirsten Shelton-Walker, Carl Greene (telephonically)

Commissioners absent: Ben Haight

Staff present: Rob Steedle, CDD Director; Beth McKibben, Planning Manager; Laura Boyce, Senior Planner; Jill Maclean, Senior Planner; Eric Feldt, Planner II; Greg Chaney, Lands and Resources Manager; Dan Bleidorn, Deputy Lands and Resources Manager; Robert Palmer, Deputy City Attorney; Michele Elfers, Chief Landscape Architect

Assembly members: Debbie White, Assembly Liaison to the Planning Commission

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a. January 10, 2017 Draft Minutes – Regular Planning Commission Meeting

b. January 24, 2017 Draft Minutes – Regular Planning Commission Meeting

MOTION: *by Mr. LeVine, to approve the January 10, 2017 and the January 24, 2017 Planning Commission regular meeting minutes with any minor changes by staff or Commission member.*

III. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

Juneau resident Mike Allen expressed his concern to the Planning Commission about the over 70 new trees which have been planted in the Statter Harbor parking area. He said the Littleleaf

Linden trees planted in the area are not native to this community and that the view from the road and from the small commercial Auke Bay area including the Squires Rest will be compromised due to the trees blocking the view. Mr. Allen said this is a parking lot, not a park. Mr. Allen showed the Commission pictures indicating how the trees will block the view from the Auke Bay area. Mr. Allen said he was told the trees were required in the Statter Harbor plan or it would not be approved by the Planning Commission. He said this was difficult for him to understand. He said it would be nice if the trees planted along the sea walk from the boat launch to the creek could be moved to restore optimal views for the area.

IV. PLANNING COMMISSION LIASON REPORT

Assembly Liaison to the Planning Commission Debbie White reported that at last night's Assembly Committee of the Whole (COW) meeting that there were two items which will be coming before the Planning Commission. A drainage easement will be requested between the Johnson Youth Center and the Sleepy Spruce Apartments. The Johnson Youth Center site is leased from the City and Borough of Juneau, she noted.

Also coming before the Commission is the possible downtown transfer of City Star Hill property to a private owner so that they can install retaining walls on their property, said Ms. White.

Of interest to the Commission is information on Senate Bill 14 which has to do with network transportation companies such as Uber and Lyft, said Ms. White. There is concern that this bill would take away local control, and those vehicles are not identified as commercial passenger vehicles, she said. In the past the Planning Commission has provided input on commercial traffic vehicle rules, said Ms. White.

The Assembly also held joint meetings with the school board and the Eaglecrest board, said Ms. White. On February 13, (2017) the Assembly heard the introduction of the ordinance which addresses the Land Use Code and the parking waivers, she said. Those items should be before the Assembly on March 6, (2017) she said.

At the February 13, (2017) meeting the Assembly also adopted their decisions on the Olmo and Meek appeals, upholding the Planning Commission decisions on both issues, she said.

V. RECONSIDERATION OF THE FOLLOWING ITEMS - None

VI. CONSENT AGENDA - None

VII. CONSIDERATION OF ORDINANCES AND RESOLUTIONS - None

VIII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS - None

IX. REGULAR AGENDA

A. SMP2016 0002 A Preliminary Plat for Phase 1 Pederson Hill Subdivision resulting in 86 Residential lots and 5 lots for preservation/park purposes.

B. CSP2016 0006 A City consistency review of Preliminary Plat Phase I Pederson Hill Subdivision resulting in 86 residential lots and five lots for preservation/park purposes.

Vice Chairman Voelckers asked Mr. Steedle to explain the differences between the two items on the same project that were before the Commission.

Mr. Steedle said the Commission has two questions to address: does this City capital project comport with adopted plans and the code, and does this subdivision as proposed meet the requirements of Title 49.15 for a preliminary plat. He said in the past these types of items have been split into two separate staff reports. He said for simplicity he felt this should be combined into one report for the Commission.

Mr. LeVine asked Mr. Steedle if there was any direction he could give to the Commission to assist with evaluating the first issue in terms of the proposed project consistency with the adopted plans. He asked how specific the Commission needs to be regarding this particular plat proposal and subdivision when making its determination about whether the proposed project and City expenditure are consistent with the plans.

Mr. Steedle said he felt the relevant question is whether there is any conflict between this item and the Comprehensive Plan and its subordinate plans. He said recently the Commission has recommended the adoption of the Housing Action Plan. The foundation for this plan is based upon studies performed over the years on Juneau's housing shortage, he added. The Assembly did adopt the Housing Action Plan by resolution, but it was not incorporated into the Comprehensive Plan, said Mr. Steedle. The Juneau Economic Development Plan as well has pointed to a lack of housing in Juneau as a key factor contributing to the constriction of economic growth within the community, he said. Mr. Steedle said he did not feel the Commission needed to get to the level of detail in the Housing Action Plan and the Economic Development Plan and the other housing action plans which have been before the Commission in the past.

Mr. LeVine said his question pertained to the specifics of the actual plat before the Commission. When making its determination, said Mr. LeVine, how specific does the Commission need to be regarding the proposed plat itself, or should it take a broader view as to how the City is using its funds to encourage development on Pederson Hill.

Mr. Steedle said the Commission should separate it from the design of Phase 1 of the subdivision.

Staff Report
Mr. Feldt told the Commission the staff's findings lists all of the findings listed under the preliminary plat section of the Land Use Code in quite extensive detail. He said his verbal report will not go into that level of detail but that he was prepared to answer any questions the Commission may have.

The Commission has two cases for one project, said Mr. Feldt. SMP 2016 0002 is a preliminary plat approval and CSP 2016 0006 is a City consistency review, he said. At the end of the presentation the Commission would have two separate motions for the two separate items on the agenda for the one project, he said.

Pederson Hill is a large vacant area that is covered by multiple properties, said Mr. Feldt. The 120 acre City property is surrounded to the north by vacant University of Alaska land, south by vacant land and Sherwood Lane, to the east by vacant University of Alaska land and to the west by a church and Glacier Highway. The proposed development encompasses about 20 acres of property.

The 1999 CBJ Land Management Plan designated the CBJ land on Pederson Hill to be considered for disposal for development once sewer was provided and a subdivision feasibility study was complete. There is now available sewer at the subject site, noted Mr. Feldt. The current proposal before the Commission is for 10 single-family units per acre, said Mr. Feldt. The subject property was rezoned in 2014 from D-1 / D-5 to a mix of D-10 and D-10 SF, said Mr. Feldt. The D-10 zoning is intended to primarily accommodate multi-family development at 10 units per acre; D-10 SF (Single Family) is intended to primarily accommodate single family residential development also at a density of 10 units per acre, said Mr. Feldt. The smaller lot sizes resulting from the rezone make it possible to achieve lower housing costs, he said. Recently a land swap has transpired between the City and a church in the area making it possible to connect the large CBJ parcel to Glacier Highway, said Mr. Feldt.

Mr. Feldt showed the Commission maps indicating the three phases of development. The D-10 SF piece would be the first to be developed, he said. Phases two and three are concepts to be developed at some point in the future, he said. Multi-family development is offered for consideration as the next phase of development with another connection to Glacier Highway, said Mr. Feldt.

Mr. Voelckers asked if the road proposed for the second phase of development was on land already acquired, or would it be a future acquisition.

Mr. Feldt said that when Mr. Chaney, the Lands and Resources Manager spoke, that he could address that question.

A public meeting on the proposed development was held in early February with Mr. Chaney and a local architect present, noted Mr. Feldt. A very detailed explanation was given regarding the development as well as conceptual drawings of what it might look like provided by the local architect, noted Mr. Feldt.

The project was also sent out for review to various City, State and federal agencies, said Mr. Feldt. The project was reviewed by:

- CBJ Engineering
- Wetland Review Board
  Feels the project reduces impact on the wetlands because it proposes higher density and a smaller area which minimizes the total acreage affected and provides - the board emphasized the importance of preserving stream quality while developing the area conservation of highly valued wetlands
- US Army Corps of Engineers
  Involved because the applicant (City) had submitted a wetland fill permit
- Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation
  Involved for habitat purposes -
- Alaska Department of Fish and Game
  Involved because of the fill in the wetlands and the construction plan located near an anadromous stream – there were several salmon in the Pederson Hill
  Creek
- Affordable Housing Commission
  Supports the project
- CBJ Capital City Fire and Rescue
  That access is provided for emergency vehicles

Mr. Feldt said the first critical step involved in the development of a major subdivision requires Planning Commission review and approval of the preliminary plat. As the project progresses it moves forward to construction drawings prepared by a private engineering company, and then circulated to the various agencies to assure that all of the proposed construction meets local codes, said Mr. Feldt. The infrastructure is then constructed or bonded. These construction improvements consist of the development of roads and utilities, added Mr. Feldt. The project would then come back to the Planning Commission for final plat approval. The subdivision plat itself can then be deemed acceptable to be recorded by the State, he said.

There are three main preliminary plat requirements, said Mr. Feldt:

1. The Platting Standards: the plat itself must be adequately prepared including surveys indicating the lot lines, the monumentation and the technical aspects of the plat itself
2. Public Improvements: must show the layout of the roads, utility lines, etc.
3. Additional Reports or Maps Addressing Unique Aspects of the Site: such as drainage, traffic, flood map, etc.

The plat would address Phase 1 which includes 86 single-family residential lots with access to Glacier Highway, said Mr. Feldt. This includes pedestrian paths and an equestrian trail, said Mr. Feldt. The equestrian trail has been relocated along Karl Reishus Boulevard, said Mr. Feldt. The equestrian trail would be located on the east side of the new street, said Mr. Feldt, showing the Commission a map. Mr. Feldt indicated on the map land allocated for a second access for emergency fire and rescue, which is required, he said, by the International Fire Code. The trail would be essentially a driveway with restricted use for emergency vehicles only, he said. At some point in the future the pedestrian trail would be connected to the trail which leads along the Mendenhall River, said Mr. Feldt.

The average lot size is about 5,000 square feet, said Mr. Feldt. The yard setbacks for the D-10 SF district are 20 feet along the front, a 10-foot rear setback and a 3-foot setback along both side lot lines, he explained. The properties abutting the east side of this subdivision are zoned D-1, said Mr. Feldt. In this situation, he said, the property which holds the greater setback applies, he noted. The project as it moves forward in the future would carry the requirement of two on-site parking spaces, he said.

The unique street names required for the subdivision are:

- Karl Reishus Boulevard, named after a police officer who died while serving the force. This is the widest street proposed for the development, and would be a collector for the other streets.
- Yan Street (Hemlock trees)
- Guwakaan Street (Black Tail deer)
- Kwalx Street (Fiddlehead ferns)
- Keishish Lane (Alders)

The interior streets will all be designed the same, with a 50-foot-wide right-of-way, five feet sidewalks on both sides, including two 12.5 feet wide driving lanes, explained Mr. Feldt. The non-motorized pathways including the equestrian trail and pedestrian walk (Wild Rose Walk) will be 10 feet wide, but where the equestrian trail needs to accommodate emergency vehicles it will be expanded to at least 20 feet in width, he said.

The US Army Corps of Engineers has provided approval to fill approximately nine acres of forested wetlands to allow for the construction of the future streets and pedestrian ways, and some buildable lots, said Mr. Feldt.

The portion of Pederson Hill Creek which has been found to be a home to spawning salmon requires a 50-foot setback on each side of the stream, said Mr. Feldt. The stream terminates in one of the preservation lots, he added. With the approval of the sale of certain portions of the wetlands there will be lots set aside in which no development will be allowed, he said. The long, narrow lot will be undeveloped for habitat purposes and to act as a buffer between the privately owned southern lot and the other adjacent development, said Mr. Feldt. City utilities will not be extended to the public use lots as they are not identified for development, said Mr. Feldt. The Land Use Code allows lots to be provided without City services, but they have to be held as public use lots, and noted on the plats, he explained.

The applicant provided a preliminary assessment and map, noted Mr. Feldt. The project is located on a hill and one side slopes toward Glacier Highway he added. The applicant proposes to allow an insignificant amount of that drainage to continue to channel along Karl Reishus Boulevard. The majority of the drainage will be connected to curb and gutter underground, said Mr. Feldt. It would then be directed along the north side of the equestrian trail and to a vacant City property, he said. The applicant has already initiated a request for an easement from the University of Alaska to cross a very small part of its property for access for the trail itself, he noted, and for the drainage as well.

Commission Comments and Questions
Mr. LeVine asked if the drainage plan changed with the relocation of the equestrian trail.

Mr. Feldt said the change to the equestrian trail has happened very recently and that he would like to let Mr. Chaney answer that question.

Staff Report
The land use code requires a fairly extensive analysis to be done regarding drainage. There are still several items on the drainage plan requirement that have not yet been submitted, noted Mr. Feldt. In past major subdivision projects those elements had also not yet been submitted and were a condition of approval, said Mr. Feldt. A detailed drainage plan addressing that section of the code must be provided at the construction drawing step, he said. When the Engineering Department reviews the storm water and drainage plan they will be looking at a complete detailed analysis for their review, said Mr. Feldt.

Commission Comments and Questions
Mr. Voelckers asked if this is the conventional process or if this is a case where it should have already been submitted with the original application.

Mr. Feldt said the situation contains a little bit of both of those aspects: the staff has accepted a partial submitted analysis knowing that there is the condition that the remainder will be submitted when it is needed at the construction drawing review.

Staff Report
Due to the high number of lots proposed a Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) was submitted. It indicated that there was acceptable intersection volume, and it did not recommend that any traffic mitigation was necessary, said Mr. Feldt.

This portion of the report involves the City consistency review, noted Mr. Feldt. This project would dispose lots to the private market, said Mr. Feldt. The 2016 Housing Action Plan calls for housing types and sizes to accommodate present and future housing needs for all economic groups, said Mr. Feldt. It also calls for preserving natural areas that possess important recreational and scenic fish and wildlife and other environmental qualities, he added. This would be a development that young families or older families wanting to downsize would be attracted to, noted Mr. Feldt. The 2016 Land Action Plan indicates which CBJ parcels should be disposed of to the general market for future development opportunities, he said.

The 2015 Juneau Economic Development Plan has an initiative to promote housing affordability and availability. Juneau's current housing stock and possible future development include the development of access roads, the installation of utilities and plat subdivision land for about 200 lots, he said. That would include phases one through three of the Pederson Hill subdivision, he said. The 2009 Non-Motorized Transportation Plan indicates a 10-foot-wide separated path across the Pederson Hill subdivision which would connect Auke Lake to the pedestrian bridge at Dimond Park, said Mr. Feldt. This will be realized later on as phases two and three of the development are constructed, he said.

There is currently a new bike path along the north side of Glacier Highway that provides a more indirect connection from Auke Lake and along Riverside Drive to the Dimond Park location, he said. The 2001 Area Wide Transportation Plan recommends support for the development of off-street pedestrian or bicycle pathways in the Mendenhall Valley area that connects to existing main pathway systems, said Mr. Feldt. The east bound pedestrian trail would eventually connect to Dimond Park, said Mr. Feldt.

Regarding the City consistently review, the staff finds that phase 1 of the Pederson Hill subdivision with the conditions and recommendations of SMP2016 0002 complies with the provisions of Title 49, the Comprehensive Plan and the CIP as required by the City and Borough of Juneau land acquisitions, disposals and projects, and the City project review, said Mr. Feldt.

The staff recommends that the Planning Commission accept the Director's analysis and findings and approve the preliminary plat for phase 1 of Pederson Hill subdivision with six conditions. The necessary elements can be met by conditions 3, (Prior to construction plan, the applicant

shall submit an updated lot closure report) 4, (prior to construction plan approval the applicant shall submit another subdivision plat to ensure labels and naming are consistent throughout the plat sheets) 5, (remove labels “Preservation Lot ” and “Park Lot ” and replace with new plat note as shown below and 6, (prior to final plat approval, the applicant shall submit another draft plat with the identified plat notes on the subdivision plat), said Mr. Feldt.

The second findings shall be met with conditions 1, (prior to construction plan approval, the applicant shall submit detailed data for future utilities per 49.15.411 (F) (7) 9, (prior to construction plan approval, the applicant shall submit a design showing a minimum 10 foot wide walking surface within the Wild Rose walk right-of-way per 49.35.610 (a), 10, (prior to construction plan approval, the applicant shall submit a lighting plan meeting applicable CBJ standards) and 11, (prior to construction plan approval, the applicant shall submit documentation ensuring compliance with section D107.1.1 of the International Fire Code), said Mr. Feldt.

The applicant will also meet conditions 2, (prior to construction plan approval, the applicant shall submit required documentation meeting 49.15.411 (6) and 8, (prior to construction plan approval, the applicant shall submit a design showing a drainage infrastructure that would allow for fish passage to the equestrian trail east of Karl Reishus Boulevard), said Mr. Feldt.

Mr. Feldt said the second motion would forward the subject proposal to the Assembly with the recommendation of approval with the conditions associated with the SMP case. This means that if the Planning Commission approves the SMP case and approves the CSP case then the conditions of the SMP will also relate to the CSP, said Mr. Feldt.

Commission Comments and Questions
Mr. LeVine asked how carefully the Commission needs to consider all 11 conditions outlined in the staff report when deciding how consistent this plan is with the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Feldt said the consistency review asks if this is consistent with the adopted City plan. The other part has to do with consistency with Title 49, he said.

Mr. Voelckers said at this point he felt it was appropriate to ask for clarification from the Deputy City Attorney. He said he felt that several Commissioners were concerned about several important distinctions between the items. Mr. Voelckers said, similar to Mr. LeVine, that he was under the impression the general consistency review was far broader in scope and did not address particular items such as conforming lighting.

Mr. Miller said that Mr. Feldt had made a statement that if the Commission approved the SMP with the accompanying conditions, that the CSP would also be approved. Mr. Miller said he did not necessarily agree that this would be the proper order. Mr. Miller said he felt the list of conditions could certainly satisfy the CSP because it is a broader review based upon its

adherence to City plans and codes. Mr. Miller said a preliminary plat is very specific with Title 49 design elements and a very specific listing of things that are required in a preliminary plat. Perhaps the conditions would not satisfy those elements, he said. Mr. Miller said he felt that perhaps consistency should be evaluated before the preliminary plat.

Mr. Palmer said he felt that this case presented one of the most unique opportunities the Commission has had at this juncture to deal with the new subdivision amendments. The CSP review and Title 49.15.580 was drafted with the intent to cover projects that do not have another permit associated with it. This is the first permit which has come before the Planning Commission for a City project that falls cleanly within another permit process that Title 49 provides, said Mr. Palmer.

One way to address this is as described by Mr. Miller, said Mr. Palmer. Another way is to actually look at the more technical aspects of the subdivision permit, review it, and within that same review the CSP process would also be satisfied, he said, because they would be doing the technical review and adherence to Title 49 as they would with any other subdivision project. When the City develops a subdivision it needs to be treated just like any other land owner who is developing a subdivision, said Mr. Palmer. The CSP process was created as a review when there is no other review process in place, said Mr. Palmer.

Mr. Voelckers said the consistency review also covers things like the capital improvement project, and then it is also up to the Planning Commission to see that the project is adequate for the community and that the City is doing the right thing for the population. He said he feels there are situations where there are projects with a permit in place in which the Commission is still asked to review the project on an overview level.

Mr. Palmer said this can certainly be done if the Commission wants to delve into that level of detail. Title 49.15.280 (a) only requires that the Commission reviews City projects for consistency with this Title when it is performing a subdivision review, he added.

Ms. McKibben said the staff recommendation is that if the preliminary plat meets requirements of Title 49 then it meets the consistency review regarding its compliance with Title 49 and in this recommendation staff has said that the preliminary plat requires conditions in order to meet the requirements of Title 49. The other piece of the consistency review is conformance with the plans which the staff has evaluated and found to be consistent with the policies of the plan. She added that there is the third piece which is the CIP (Capital Improvement Projects) under which this project is already listed in various formats.

Mr. LeVine said he understands that the Commission needs to review the plat and its consistency with Title 49 under which there are numerous conditions which must be met. He said from listening to Mr. Palmer and Ms. McKibben that if the Commission finds that the findings and conditions meet Title 49 then they had found consistency with the Plan. He said he

wonders if a subdivision could be concocted by the City which meets Title 49 but which is demonstrably inconsistent with the Housing Action Plan or the Comprehensive Plan, for example. Mr. LeVine said in his opinion he did not think a condition about a lighting plan has anything to do with consistency with the broad policies of the Housing Action Plan, for example.

Ms. McKibben said that goes back to Title 49.10.170 which requires the Planning Commission to review the City projects for consistency with the plans. Ms. McKibben said that perhaps Mr. LeVine was co-mingling the items a bit more than she was. She said to her lighting is part of the preliminary plat review for consistency with Title 49, not necessarily for consistency with the plan.

Mr. LeVine said if they were to approve this they would need two motions: one which would state they would approve the preliminary plat subject to 11 conditions, and another motion stating that the Commission found this proposal consistent with plans.

Applicant

Mr. Chaney said this process has taken over 10 years. The installation of the sewer line in this area was a huge investment by the City making this development possible, said Mr. Chaney. The lots currently up for review are now zoned D-10 SF with the other two phases of the project also zoned D-10SF, said Mr. Chaney. The rest of the region is zoned D-10 for multi-family development. That rezone was approved in 2014, he noted. He said they felt the community needed more small affordable single family homes, and that development within the community has been fairly strong over the last few years with the building of multi-housing developments. The land trade with the church was also critical for this project as it provides access between the project and Glacier Highway, said Mr. Chaney. They are also asked to look for partners, because this is an expensive project, he said. Tlingit and Haida Regional Housing Corporation has expressed interest in partnering with the City on this project, said Mr. Chaney. The City will be seeking other partners as well, he noted.

This is a neighborhood layout, said Mr. Chaney, with sidewalks on both sides of the streets. They have already received an Army Corps of Engineers fill permit, said Mr. Chaney. They are still discussing how they would put the project out to bid; whether to put the lots out for bid in bite-size chunks rather than all at once, said Mr. Chaney. Park Place is a similar type of development in the Mendenhall Valley next to Rotary Park that is zoned D-18, said Mr. Chaney. Those are single-family attached homes with a much denser zoning than the proposed development, he said. Another example of similar density is the lots in Chelsea Court which are closer in size to the proposed Pederson Hill development, said Mr. Chaney.

Mr. Chaney said a 728 square foot starter home with one bedroom and one bathroom could be built for an estimated cost of about $146,000 for the house itself, excluding the land. The lot would be valued at about $100,000, said Mr. Chaney. With the cost of land included, there could be a starter home built for $250,000, said Mr. Chaney. With the cost of a master

bedroom and bath addition the cost for the home itself would climb to about $211,000, said Mr. Chaney. A third bedroom would put the cost at about $268,000 he said. So a three bedroom, two bath home with the garage would come to over $400,000, he said.

It is up to the Assembly to decide how the lots would be released, said Mr. Chaney. They could have some lots open for sealed competitive bids and some blocks of lots open for contractors, or a fair market value lottery, said Mr. Chaney. There are a variety of ways these lots could be released to a variety of groups, said Mr. Chaney.

If the Auke Bay Bypass ever came to fruition, it may nick a corner of the development but probably not, noted Mr. Chaney. If this item is approved tonight it will next go before the Assembly at its March 13, (2017) meeting, said Mr. Chaney. Assuming approval in the spring, detailed engineering for the project would begin, he said. The bid opening would happen sometime in the fall, said Mr. Chaney.

Commission Comments and Questions
Replying to a note from the staff, Mr. Chaney stated that this project is consistent with the Land Management Plan which was adopted in 2016.

Mr. LeVine asked if the plans for drainage have changed with the relocation of the equestrian trail.

The plans have changed somewhat, said Mr. Chaney. They would probably have to construct a berm to direct the drainage to the desired area, said Mr. Chaney.

Mr. Miller asked how far along the plans were when they were reviewed by the Wetlands Review Board in the summer. Mr. Miller noted that the Wetlands Review Board had favorably commented on the open channel streamflow which he does not see in the existing plans. He said he wondered if the wetlands review board was aware that the majority of the drainage would be underground.

Mr. Chaney said the designs were pretty far along when reviewed by the Wetlands Review Board. He said this is a hybrid drainage plan with some sculpting of the landscape to preserve the existing natural drainage on the property. There will also be a fish passage structure, he said. The drainage coming off of the roads will come down, go through an oil water separator, then go to a berm area with a swale in the bottom, he added. There simply is not enough room to have open ditches and sidewalks in a neighborhood with this size of lots, he said.

Mr. Dye asked if the open swale near the equestrian trail would be running perpendicular to the stream.

Mr. Chaney said it will have to be designed to have water running underneath and a swale constructed above. There will be an actual drainage ditch constructed over the stream, said Mr. Chaney.

Mr. Miller asked how the 50-foot setback from the stream could be met with an 80-foot-wide lot.

That lot is set aside as a conservation area and it will not be built upon, said Mr. Chaney.

Mr. Voelckers said he thought the 50-foot buffer ended at lot 12 and then becomes unregulated.

Mr. Hickok asked about how snow storage would be handled.

Mr. Chaney pointed on a map to the areas where snow could be stored. The snow will not need to be trucked out, said Mr. Chaney.

Mr. Hickok asked if parking would be allowed on the streets.

Parking would not be allowed when there was snow which Public Works needed to plow, commented Mr. Chaney.

Mr. LeVine said he wondered with the subsequent phases if there had been analysis on the cumulative impacts on the wetlands.

Mr. Chaney said the vast majority of the property in this area owned by the City is not being developed. With development of the subsequent phases more decisions would need to be made, said Mr. Chaney.

Mr. Miller said he has lived in a subdivision with the sidewalk only on one side and that there was room at the end of the road for snow removal. However, he said the snow would not all be able to accumulate at the end of the road and that it would end up on the sides of the road as well, which would put snow over both sidewalks in some places.

Mr. Chaney said there will certainly be years of very heavy snowfall when it could be backed up onto the sidewalks, but that they are designing the development for a typical year.

In answer to Mr. Dye's question about the equestrian trail, Mr. Chaney said when it goes along the sidewalk along the main road it may be as narrow as five feet.

Mr. Voelckers asked if the City currently has reasonably accurate construction cost estimates. He asked how those numbers aggregate for this development.

This is basically a road project, said Mr. Chaney. He added that you never really know until the bids are opened. They currently have rough numbers, he said. The last time they did a subdivision the bid came in 70 percent below the engineer's estimate, he said. The current estimate is for about $8 million for full construction costs. They hope to bring this project in for less than the fair market value of the lot, he said.

Mr. Miller said other preliminary plats he has seen or been involved with had drainage easements, especially in a tight neighborhood like this. He said every single lot is going to be a challenge. Usually in the preliminary plat phase drainage is required to be shown, he said.

Mr. Chaney said it is their intent to plat drainage easements along property lines. They had a pretty refined plan for this development and then with the subsequent adoption of the new subdivision ordinance they have had to adjust their plans, said Mr. Chaney. He said drainage easements could have been included in this plat and he is sorry that they are not included. The requirements for a preliminary plat are now much more detailed, he said.

Mr. Chaney said if he were in the private sector and required to do this thorough level of detail for the roads and the drainage, it would be extremely unfortunate if it were then denied. Preliminary plats can be denied, said Mr. Chaney. If he were a private developer, said Mr. Chaney, and he put all of this money into developing the plat and that was denied, he would be extremely disappointed. With the final plat, said Mr. Chaney, individuals are investing money in something that they know they will get a return on.

Public Comment

Juneau resident Jeremy Sidney said that his parents own Swampy Acres, land contiguous to the proposed Pederson Hill development. Mr. Sidney asked what the cost was for the City to acquire the Pederson Hill property. He also asked what the property would go for if it was sold on the open market. Mr. Sidney also complained that all of the residents along Glacier Highway in that area had to help pay for the sewer lines which were installed which the City was then going to use for the Pederson Hill development. He said he did not think this was fair.

He asked if the lots in the proposed subdivision would be filled and ready to build. He said after the lots are purchased it will cost $25,000 - $35,000 to fill in each lot. He said he felt the City was becoming housing developers for the private sector. He said he felt this was a really big mistake which the City should not have done. He said he did not feel it was the City's role as a government to be in the land developing business.

Carl Koch, wildlife biologist for the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, said there is about 400 acres surrounding that area between the Auke Lake and the Brotherhood Bridge trail. That area is used by black bears, wolves, coyotes and deer, he said. It is a very important travel corridor and most of the animals passed through the proposed subdivision, he said. He said

they recommend some sort of buffers such as around the equestrian trail or the bottom half of the hill.

Commission Comments and Questions
Mr. LeVine said they have notes from Fish and Game regarding the anadromous stream but they have no information on the wildlife in their packet from Fish and Game. He asked if this was just reviewed by the fish portion of Fish and Game and not the wildlife portion.

Mr. Koch said he felt this went through the Habitat Division and it frequently focuses on fish. He said this issue was only brought to his attention today when one of his colleagues asked him to come and speak before the Commission.

Juneau resident Bobbi Epperly said she found the timing of the Pederson Hill subdivision to be poor judgment on the City's part. She said the current economic outlook for Alaska is bleak with the loss of jobs, revenue, and people moving out of the state. She said spending 4 ½ million dollars and asking investors for the balance is fiscally irresponsible during a time of recession. She said CBJ is basing this project upon a housing shortage and demand which was prevalent in the community 10 years ago. Juneau's population has been dropping and in 2016 she said Juneau has lost 600 people from its population. She said the microscopic lots are overpriced and that homes will not sell at a low enough price to be of benefit to individuals with lower incomes.

Dr. Eric Olsen said he is the owner of the Family Practice building which is located across Glacier Highway in close proximity to the proposed development. He asked the Commission to consider the safety of the intersection in this area which would then be a four-way intersection. He said Family Practice must be included as an element when considering the safety concerns on the road. He said that Family Practice alone probably generates 60 trips per hour during certain times of the day in addition to the 86 trips per hour estimated to be engendered by the proposed Pederson Hill development. He said they prepared their lot for construction in 1984 and the cost of clearing out the lot and preparing it was $100,000 at that time.

Juneau resident Zachary Stetson said he is 23 years old and that he moved to Juneau several years ago. He said he has found the housing market in Juneau to be extremely difficult. He said he purchased a condominium about one year ago. He said, with a degree in accounting, that he cannot afford a house, and there are many other people in Juneau with lower incomes who would also not be able to afford a home. He said he is in full support of more housing in Juneau.

Former Commission member and Juneau resident Dennis Watson said he was in support of this development. He said he has been an employer in Juneau until just a few years ago and that it is very difficult to recruit people to move to Juneau once they discover how much housing costs in the community. In this case the Borough is taking up a lot of the responsibility of the

development of the subdivision providing paved streets and sidewalks on both sides and utilities. Mr. Watson said one concern he has is that although Swampy Acres is currently a farm site, at some point in the future that could be developed into a commercial property. He suggested that potential property buyers in the Pederson Hill development be made aware of that future possibility of commercial development in their area. He said he feels this project is in compliance with the code and that he felt it would be a disservice to the community if the City did not move forward with the development.

Juneau resident and former Chancellor of the University of Alaska Southeast John Pugh spoke in favor of the Pederson Hill subdivision. He said he has been a resident of the "flats" in Juneau for 37 years. Their area is constructed upon small lots with tight housing and he said they have never been bothered by a lack of privacy. He said that he knows his neighbors really well and that they have developed into a neighborhood that takes care of each other because of how close they live together. He said there are real opportunities to develop a tight neighborhood where friends can be made and neighbors can help take care of one another. He said he felt the Pederson Hill neighborhood would provide many advantages for employers such as the University of Alaska employees which would benefit from that housing.

Applicant

The CSP is a recommendation to the Assembly, said Mr. Chaney. The approval or denial of the plat is for the subdivision development, said Mr. Chaney.

The City's lot preparation will be minimal, said Mr. Chaney. He said he would not be surprised if it did not cost a fair amount to develop the lots prior to construction. The City has spent about $200,000 on the project to date which is for design, said Mr. Chaney. The amount of money the residents were assessed for the extension of the sewer line was less than half the amount of the cost of that project, said Mr. Chaney. The City pays more than half of those costs, he said. The purpose of extending the sewer was so they could increase the density in the area, he said. The City acquired the property from the State of Alaska, he said. The City's cash outlay for the project is therefore very low, he said. Providing a buffer for the wildlife is a problem if you only look within the proposed subdivision boundary, said Mr. Chaney. They are leaving a lot of this area outside of the proposed subdivison undeveloped, he noted, which will be available for animal crossings. They do not need to release the lots if the market is flooded and the community is in a recession, said Mr. Chaney.

Commission Comments and Questions

Mr. Miller noted there has been some comment by private developers in the community that they were being held to a different standard than the City in terms of the development process. Mr. Miller said in reviewing the documents he felt there may be some of this transpiring with this project. He said he knew the standard was different for City road construction than those for developers building their own roads, for example. He said he did not feel that the 50-foot stream setback was addressed clearly with this development at the preliminary plat stage. He

said typically in every situation he has been involved in this would have had to have been done at this stage. He said perhaps with the enactment of the new subdivision rules that plat requirements have changed. Mr. Miller said he has never been involved in a situation where a plat note could come before the Planning Commission before it was finalized. He asked Mr. Chaney for his input on any discrepancies between City and private development procedures.

Mr. Chaney said that all subdivisions are different from each other. He said a private developer would have probably kept that lot and simply put a 50-foot setback from the stream. For this development they have actually set aside the lot for conservation purposes rather than for just the provision of a setback. 50' setbacks are rarely shown on the plat because they actually move with the stream and as the stream changes course so will the setback, said Mr. Chaney. They submitted their design about 10 months ago and so far had about five rounds with the reviewing agent for the City involving many corrections. There has been no intent at any point in the review process for the standards for this project to be held any lower than what a private developer would experience, said Mr. Chaney.

Mr. Steedle said the review for this development has been treated the same as the previous subdivision which went through the new subdivision ordinance requirements. They have tightened up the requirement for a preliminary plat, noted Mr. Steedle; maybe they are too tight, he said.

Mr. Frisby asked about the solicitation process for comment from agencies. He said he was referring to Fish and Game which initially just commented on the anadromous stream.

Mr. Feldt said when comments are solicited from other agencies they have one point of contact with that agency.

Ms. Shelton-Walker asked Mr. Chaney if he had any comment on the remarks made by Dr. Olsen, the owner of Family Practice, about traffic intersections in the area.

Mr. Chaney said the traffic engineer reviewed the intersection and determined that putting that intersection in would be acceptable. He said he knows there is an attempt to improve the area around Wild Meadow Lane. That might change the traffic flow in that area as well, he said.

Mr. LeVine said he was troubled on a few levels regarding the lack of proper contact with Fish and Game on this project. He said he felt this reflected a certain lack of communication within its own agency on the part of Fish and Game. He said also he felt it was their job to try to prevent interaction between bears and people. He asked how it would affect the development process to provide a decent buffer for the travel of wildlife in the area. Mr. LeVine said he felt this was an important consideration.

Mr. Chaney said he guessed they would lose about 20 lots because the development is already pushing up the hillside and cannot really proceed any further up the hill. There is already a large portion of land set aside for wildlife habitat which cannot be built on, said Mr. Chaney.

Mr. Voelckers asked if there have been studies done on the travel patterns of the animals in the area as far as where they are coming from and where they are going to.

Mr. Chaney said he knew that wildlife likes to spend the winters on the Mendenhall Peninsula because it is warmer in general. He added there definitely is passage of wildlife in this area. He said he was not aware of the exact corridors that they use for passage.

Mr. Voelckers said there were two motions to be made by the Commission and that perhaps it made the most sense to do the broad consistency review prior to the plat itself.

Mr. Voelckers said they were going to bring Mr. Palmer forward for more commentary on whether the Commission needed to make one motion or two motions regarding the Pederson Hill subdivision.

The first question asked by Mr. LeVine is how deep of a review on this subdivision the commission needs to Perform at this point, said Mr. Palmer. When the subdivision ordinance was amended in 2015 and 49.15.580 (a) was specifically amended to clarify that when a City project is before the Commission the only thing the Commission has to do is to look for consistency with Title 49. This is different than it was in the past, said Mr. Palmer. Mr. Palmer recommended that the Commission look at 49.15.580. He said if the Commission wants to do both a CSP and a subdivision review it can do so. But the code only requires the Commission to do a subdivision review, he said. Part of that logic is that the Planning Commission is the platting authority for major subdivisions, said Mr. Palmer. If the CSP is done there is nothing the Assembly can do because the subdivision determination by the Planning Commission is the final authority on the subdivision.

Mr. Voelckers said based upon the information just provided by Mr. Palmer that the Commission will be reviewing SMP2016 0002.

MOTION: *by Mr. Miller, to approve SMP2016 0002 with staff's findings, analysis and conditions.*

Speaking in favor of his motion, Mr. Miller said this project has been a long time in development and that in the previous nine years he served on the Planning Commission he recalled that a lot of work was done trying to make housing more affordable for the community. He said there is no single action which can accomplish this, and 10 years ago this is one of the few pieces of CBJ property identified as developable. Due to the small size of the lots there will definitely be some issues in their development and that lots of preparation will

certainly be expensive. There is the possibility that smaller homes may be built and there is the possibility that they may provide less expensive homes for members of the community to purchase, said Mr. Miller.

Ms. Shelton-Walker said she does have some concerns about an adequate habitat buffer for the development. She said she does support the motion and she does not want to hold up the development of but that she would like to see attention paid to the wildlife corridor as this project moves forward.

Mr. LeVine said he shared the concerns just expressed by Ms. Shelton-Walker. He said he wanted to encourage the City to think carefully as it moved forward in its development and in future phases of the project. He added that he felt it was not the best process to be approving a project with items placed as conditions when they are items which could have already been addressed prior to coming before the Planning Commission. These items should not be coming before the Planning Commission with items such as this listed as conditions, said Mr. LeVine. He added they should be resolved prior to coming before the Planning Commission. He said he encouraged the Community Development Department to see that these items are addressed before they come to the Commission in the future. He said he did approve of the project and that no variances would be required.

Mr. Hickok said he had lots of concerns about this project. He said he kind of agreed with Mr. Sidney and that perhaps the City should not be involved in the development of land. He said he did not know if chopping up a piece of property would make it affordable. He said he felt indifferent about the project but that he has often heard the need expressed for affordable housing. He said he would vote in favor of the motion.

Mr. Dye spoke in favor of the motion, saying that the Commission's role was to ascertain if this project was consistent with Title 49, not if the City should be in the development business or not.

Mr. Greene said he was in support of the motion.

Mr. LeVine said he did want to go on the record and say he felt this project was consistent with the codes and plans that it must abide by.

Mr. Frisby said he did have some concerns about the wildlife and that he did think that some studies on that topic have been completed in that area. He requested that the staff explore and see if it could identify studies done on the wildlife in that area. He said he felt a buffer was very important for the wildlife which migrates through that area.

Roll Call Vote:

Yeas: Mr. Hickok, Mr. Miller, Mr. LeVine, Mr. Frisby, Mr. Greene, Ms. Shelton-Walker, Mr. Dye
Mr. Voelckers

The motion passed by unanimous vote.

X. BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT - None

XI. OTHER BUSINESS

Recycle Works Presentation: The slide show detailing the information provided by Ms. Elfers can be accessed at Juneau recycling.com.

Ms. Elfers said she has been making this presentation to various groups and agencies within Juneau. They will be making this presentation to the Assembly Committee of the Whole in March, she said. A lot of the talk in Juneau is in regard to the cost of bringing goods into the community. But also the disposal of goods needs to be considered, said Ms. Elfers. They either need to be shipped out or dealt with locally, she said.

The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) states that it should be possible to recycle 60% to 70% of our trash, she said. Juneau currently recycles about 10% of its waste, she said.
of cardboard a year.

The landfill is owned by a private company called Waste Management, said Ms. Elfers. This is a worldwide company, she said. Arrow Refuse, a private company, collects the garbage, said Ms. Elfers. The City at this point cannot legally collect garbage, she said. The City could obtain a certificate so that it could collect the garbage but the costs were too high when this was explored several years ago, she said. Therefore, the City cannot control where the garbage goes or what happens to it, she added. The City can collect recycling, she said.

In 20 years the landfill will be full, she said. It is difficult to identify a location for a new landfill, she said. There is really not flat, accessible land for that site, she said. Regulatory requirements for landfills are very high, she said. Another option is to ship garbage to the lower 48, she said. That will probably happen unless other options are identified within the next 20 years, she said. The cost for an incinerator is prohibitive, she said.

Mr. Frisby asked for a distinction between the recycling which is collected by the trucks and the recycling which is dropped off at the recycling center.

The recycle works program has been focusing its efforts recently on maximizing diversion of waste from the landfill for beneficial reuse. They also have a hazardous waste facility located at

Lemon Creek which has been a popular program, she said. They also have a junk metal recycling program, she said, in which they collect junk cars. Through a contractor they take noncommercial vehicles for free, she said.

For recycling the City has a drop off program at the CBJ landfill, said Ms. Elfers. Arrow Refuse runs the recycling program picked up by its trucks, she said. Within the last year the City has installed recycling drop boxes throughout the community which it takes back to the recycling center, she said. This program has been wildly successful, she said. They have five more drop box containers arriving within the next few weeks, she said.

Commission Comments and Questions
Mr. Hickok said he owns a liquor store. He said he did not feel it was necessary for Alaskan Brewery to deliver their product to the local liquor stores in large cardboard containers.

Ms. Elfers said she thought that was a great idea and that going to the source to reduce waste is a popular component of recycling.

Ms. Elfers said they were surprised when the curbside recycling program began, that the drop-off recycling at the CBJ site still remains strong.

Mr. LeVine asked how Arrow can make money shipping recycling down south and not the City doing the same thing.

Ms. Elfers said mixed recycling such as Arrow does is for ease of use. It sends the recycling to a recycling center where the items which do have value are salvaged and the items which cannot be recycled are put in the landfill. There is no recycling market at this time for plastic other than the type that the CBJ accepts for recycling, said Ms. Elfers.

Composting is a way the community can recycle locally and not have to ship items out of the community, said Ms. Elfers.

Mr. Voelckers commented that extending the longevity of the landfill through recycling must have value for the community.

It is a difficult calculation to make, said Ms. Elfers, since they cannot foresee what shipping costs will be in the future.

Mr. LeVine said there has been a lot of interest in the community on composting. He said it is a shame that items such as lawn waste are placed into the landfill.

There is not currently a composting pilot program, said Ms. Elfers. They have been identifying pilot programs for review. Mr. Frisby asked what the recycling rates were between Arrow and CBJ recycling. Ms. Elfers said she was not sure what the rates were at this time.

Mr. Voelckers asked what the relationship was like between Arrow Refuse and the City. He asked if Arrow was amenable to working more closely together with the City.

They do not collaborate with each other, said Ms. Elfers. She said she feels that is a good direction in which to move.

Mr. LeVine asked if the study has been done on the costs and benefits of recycling, and of some form of mandatory recycling.

Ms. Elfers said she thinks the direction the City needs to head in is partnering with the other waste entities in town which is Waste Management and Arrow Refuse.

Ms. Shelton-Walker said she felt it was very important that the community recycle as much as it could with recycling that can remain within the community.

Ms. Elfers said she is not aware of at this time of any waste technology programs which would be economically feasible for the community.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

The APOC filing is due by March 15, (2017) for Commission members, said Mr. Steedle.

Ms. McKibben reported that there is a Title 49 Committee meeting on March 8, (2017) at 3:15 pm.

XII. REPORT OF REGULAR AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

Wetlands Review Board
Mr. Miller reported that there was a Wetlands Review Board meeting on January 19, (2017). They did a Juneau Wetlands Management Plan update. WESPAK (Wetland Ecosystem Services Protocol for Southeast Alaska (WESPAK-SE) is the new means of determining wetlands. There was a pretty extensive peer review that WESPAK underwent and it appears to be a successful venture and ready to function, said Mr. Miller.

XIII. PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS – None

XIV. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 10:34 p.m.